

1 On May 4, 2000, the DOP Director's designee, Paul Peterson, conducted an allocation review of
2 Appellant's position. By letter dated June 5, 2000, Mr. Peterson determined that Appellant's
3 position was properly allocated to the Information Technology Applications Specialist 5
4 classification. On June 16, 2000, Appellant filed timely exceptions to the Director's determination
5 with the Personnel Appeals Board. Appellant's exceptions are the subject of this proceeding.

6 Appellant's position is located in the agency's Information Services division. Appellant is the
7 agency's highest level authority for Imaging Technology. His duties included coordinating all
8 technical support for the agency's state-wide critical client-server document imaging system for
9 state industrial insurance claims. Appellant provides services to all regions and divisions of the
10 agency.

11
12 **Summary of Appellant's Argument.** Appellant argues that his duties and responsibilities, as
13 described in his classification questionnaire (CQ), are encompassed by the ITS/AS 6 classification.
14 Appellant asserts that he is the agency's highest-level authority in the specialty area of document
15 imaging technology and that he has matrix responsibility for coordinating technical support for a
16 major system called WISE (With Imaging Service Excellence). Appellant argues that WISE is a
17 state-wide critical client-server document imaging system that serves all regions and divisions of
18 the agency. Appellant contends that he is responsible for ensuring that changes in technology do
19 not negatively impact the WISE system. Appellant further contends that his duties and
20 responsibilities require him to understand the business functions of agency customers and to
21 understand the impact that technology changes may have on customers and agency staff. Appellant
22 also contends that he is required to assess the impact of system administration site implementation
23 plans and contingencies, to act as the technical person for various system reviews, and to evaluate
24 proposals and recommend appropriate changes. Appellant asserts that the level and scope of his
25 duties and responsibilities are best described by the ITS/AS 6 classification.

1 **Summary of Respondent's Argument.** Respondent argues that before an employee can be
2 allocated to the ITS/AS 6 level, the employee must be designated in writing as the highest-level
3 authority for the agency in an information technology specialty area. Respondent asserts that in
4 Appellant's case, written designation would be given by the Shelagh Taylor, Assistant Director for
5 Information Services, and memorialized with a form signed by Ms. Taylor that specifically states
6 that Appellant's position was given such a designation. However, Respondent contends that a form
7 has not been completed for Appellant's position and highest-level authority has not been given to
8 Appellant. Respondent further argues that document imaging technology is not a specialty
9 anticipated by the ITS/AS 6 classification and that Appellant's supervisor, Marc Abraham, is the
10 lead for the WISE system and is responsible for coordinating outages and changes to the system.
11 Respondent asserts that Appellant's duties and responsibilities are described by the ITAS 5
12 classification.

13 **Primary Issue.** Whether the Director's determination that Appellant's position was properly
14 allocated to the Information Technology Applications Specialist 5 classification should be affirmed.
15

16 **Relevant Classifications.** Information Technology Applications Specialist 5, class code 03295,
17 and Information Technology Systems/Applications Specialist 6, class code 03286.
18

19 **Decision of the Board.** The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification best
20 describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. A position review is neither a
21 measurement of the volume of work performed nor an evaluation of the expertise with which that
22 work is performed. Also, a position review is not a comparison of work performed by employees in
23 similar positions. A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a particular
24 position to the available classification specifications. This review results in a determination of the
25 class which best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. Liddle-Stamper v.
26 Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

1 Allocation of a position must be based on the overall duties and responsibilities assigned to an
2 individual position compared to the existing classifications. Flahaut v. Dept's of Personnel and
3 Labor and Industries, PAB No. ALLO 96-0009 (1996).

4 At the ITAS 5 level, incumbents are professional, technical specialists whose positions focus on and
5 are responsible for agency-level, large-scale applications, projects or databases that have high risk
6 and high impact. Incumbents at this level utilize broad technical knowledge in analyzing,
7 consulting, designing, programming, maintaining, or supporting major applications, support
8 products, projects, databases or database management systems.

9
10 At the ITS/AS 6 level, incumbents are designated in writing as the highest level authority in an
11 information technology specialty area, they serve as the agency's spokesperson in their area of
12 technical expertise and serve as a technical mentor, coach and trainer to others.

13 Appellant's CQ is signed by his supervisor, Marc Abraham, and by the Assistant Director for
14 Information Services, Shelagh Taylor. Both Mr. Abraham and Ms. Taylor agree with the
15 description of Appellant's duties and responsibilities as documented in his CQ. Appellant's CQ
16 states, in part:

17
18 Serves as the agency's highest level authority in document imaging technology. . . .

19 Provides consultation at the highest technical level to managers, applications
20 developers, and technical staff, and customers regarding imaging technology and
21 current agency applications. Leads other technical staff in the maintenance,
22 development, problem resolution, risk assessment, and task prioritization required
23 for imaging operations.

24 . . . Acts as the highest technical specialist in the Department for determining the
25 technical architecture and platforms for providing imaging technology

26 Position allocations are "based upon an investigation of duties and responsibilities assigned and/or
performed and other information and recommendations." (WAC 356-20-200). Because a current

1 and accurate description of a position's duties and responsibilities is documented in an approved
2 classification questionnaire, the classification questionnaire becomes the basis for allocation of a
3 position. An allocation determination must be based on the overall duties and responsibilities, as
4 documented in the CQ. Jacobson v. Dept of Ecology, PAB No. ALLO 99-0004 (2000).

5
6 In this case, Appellant's CQ describes duties at the ITS/AS 6 level.

7 **Conclusion.** The appeal on exceptions by Appellant should be granted and his position should be
8 reallocated to the Information Technology Systems/Applications Specialist 6 classification. The
9 determination of the Director, dated June 5, 2000, should be reversed.

10
11 **ORDER**

12 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by Appellant is
13 granted, the determination of the Director, dated June 5, 2000, is reversed, and Appellant's position
14 is reallocated to the Information Technology Systems/Applications Specialist 6 classification,
15 effective July 1, 1999.

16 DATED this _____ day of _____, 2000.

17 WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

18
19 _____
20 Gerald L. Morgen, Vice, Chair

21 _____
22 Leana D. Lamb, Member